

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/764,974

Applicant(s)

SCHASCHKE, HNAS-
JURGEN

Examiner

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc Jimenez.

(3) _____.

(2) Ashley Pezzner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 October 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement was reached with respect to the claims. However, it was determined that Mr. Pezzner received an incorrect office action which did not match with the office action that Examiner Jimenez has in the application file. Mr. Pezzner faxed a copy of the office action mailed 8/1/02 that Mr. Pezzner received to Examiner Jimenez and Examiner Jimenez verified that the office action that was mailed on 8/1/02 was not the same office action that was in the application file. Examiner Jimenez informed Mr. Pezzner that the correct office action will be remailed and the time for response will be restarted .


GREGORY M. VIDOVICH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
SPE AV 3726